

**Planning Commission Meeting
October 5, 1999**

The San Bruno Planning Commission held its regular meeting on Tuesday, October 5, 1999 in the City Hall Council Chambers. Chairman Marshall called the meeting to order at 7:05 P.M. Roll call found C. Birt, Petersen, Johnson, Sammut present. Absent: C. Schindler. Staff present: George D. Foscardo, Community and Economic Development Director; Steve Padovan, Associate Planner; Jonathan Lowell, City Attorney; Jan Aki, Recording Secretary. C. Johnson led the assemblage in the Pledge of Allegiance.

1. Approval of Minutes (Tape 392)

Minutes will be available at the November 16, 1999 meeting.

2. Communications (Tape 392)

Mr. Foscardo announced that Michael Peterson had given verbal notice of his resignation from the Commission, however, he did indicate that he would like to remain involved in some of the future planning activities.

3. Public Comment Items Not on Agenda - None

4. 2341 Fleetwood Drive (Continued from September 21, 1999) (Tape File 392-A)

Request for a Use Permit to allow a large family day care facility in a single-family residential (R-1) zoning district; per Sections 12.84.200 and 12.96.060 of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance. Use Permit 99-31 (Public Hearing) Environmental Determination: Categorical Exemption Zoning: Single Family Residential (R-1)

Mr. Padovan entered staff report dated October 5, 1999 into the record. Transparencies of the project were shown. Mr. Padovan added the owner has covered the large hole on the second level with plywood. C. Marshall inquired about state licensing. Mr. Padovan responded the state typically will issue a license once the Fire Department requirements are met.

The public hearing opened. Maritza Montecino, property owner and applicant, was present. C. Johnson commented it appears they have done a good job in making changes to the site and Ms. Montecino confirmed they will only use the downstairs area, however, when she is alone she does go upstairs to use the kitchen. C. Johnson pointed out there are two agencies involved here; the city Fire Department will require sprinklers if the upstairs is used and the State will not issue a license until the Fire Department requirements are met.

C. Sammut asked if she was aware of the conditions of approval. Ms. Montecino said she was but it would take a while to install the retaining wall. C. Marshall mentioned when he visited the property no one answered the front door or the garage door which leads to a concern with safety if someone is picking up their child. Ms. Montecino responded there are two side gates which the parents are aware of and use for entry. C. Johnson said there is an enter sign and latch on the gate and it is obvious a new entry door is being constructed.

C. Birt asked if permits would be required for the patio and fire wall in the garage. Also, if a landing would be required on the patio at the sliding doors. Mr. Padovan said a permit is not required for a concrete patio but one would be needed for the garage wall. There is no difference in grade between the floor of the house and the patio. C. Johnson suggested options other than a concrete patio be

Planning Commission Meeting
October 5, 1999 - Page 2

explored since there could be a noise factor with wheel toys. Perhaps tan bark would be a solution. C. Petersen asked who would do the excavation under the deck and if the possibility that the deck could collapse during construction was considered. Ms. Montecino responded they will do the work and build a retaining wall and they did not consider the possibility that the deck could collapse if the earth moved.

Jack Modica, Fleetwood Drive, said he heard something about a firewall and the deck collapsing and the firewall is between the garage and daycare.

The public hearing closed without objection.

C. Johnson said she spoke with three of the neighbors and they indicated that parking and noise were not issues and supported the project. The applicant has made excellent attempts to make the area safe and follow up on input from the Commission.

M/S Sammut, Johnson that the San Bruno Planning Commission approve Use Permit 99-31 subject to the following finding of facts and conditions; passed by the following vote:

AYES: C. Sammut, Johnson, Petersen, Birt, Marshall

NOES: None ABSENT: C. Schindler

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Proper notice of the public hearing was given by legal notice published in the San Bruno Herald, Saturday, September 11, 1999 and notice mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the site on September 9, 1999.
2. Noticing of the public hearing, conduct of said hearing, and an opportunity for all parties to present testimony was completed in accordance with the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Zoning, Chapter 12.132.
3. The applicant has been notified, both verbally and in writing herein, of the City's provision for an administrative appeal of the Planning Commission's final action to the City Council as provided for in the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.140.
4. The Use Permit to operate a large (up to 14 children) family day care home at the single family house at 2341 Fleetwood Drive will not be injurious or detrimental to the property and improvements in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the city because the use is compatible with existing residential uses in the neighborhood and complies with the requirements of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance regarding height, setback and parking regulations.
5. The general appearance of the residence at 2341 Fleetwood Drive is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood and will not be detrimental to the adjacent real property because no structural exterior changes or modifications to the residence are proposed.
6. The proposed large family day care home is consistent with the San Bruno General Plan, which designates the property for low density residential purposes.

Planning Commission Meeting
October 5, 1999 - Page 3

7. The use will not unreasonably restrict or interfere with light and air on the property and other property in the neighborhood, will not hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of land and buildings in the neighborhood, or impair the value thereof, and is consistent with the design and scale of the neighborhood because of the reasons listed in # 4 and 5 above.
8. The proposed project is Categorically Exempt per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15301, Class 1: Existing Facilities.
9. Traffic impacts to the neighborhood will be less than significant due to the nature of the business operation, the staggered pick-up and drop-off time of the children, and the minimal increase in the total number of children.
10. There are no large family day care uses within 1000 feet of this proposed facility, therefore, concentration of these types of uses is not occurring in this neighborhood.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the "Summary of Hearing" to the Department of Planning and Building within 30 days of Planning Commission approval. Until such time as the Summary is filed the use permit shall not be valid for any purpose. The use permit shall expire one (1) year from the date of Planning Commission approval unless instituted.
2. The large family day care home at 2341 Fleetwood Drive shall operate according to the Applicant's Support Statement, plans and policy submitted to the Planning Commission on September 21 and October 5, 1999 and according to information contained in the exhibit section herein, except as required to be modified by these conditions of approval. Any modification to this permit shall require prior review and approval by the Director of Planning and Building.
3. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City.
4. The existing house and garage shall be used only as a single family residential dwelling unit and a large family day care home. No portion of the residence may be rented out as a separate living unit.
5. The existing garage shall not be utilized as habitable floor area for child care and shall be maintained for two covered off-street vehicle parking spaces for the residence.
6. A self-closing, solid core door shall be installed separating the garage from the day care area in the basement.
7. Prior to occupancy for a large family child day care home the applicant shall obtain a City of San Bruno Business License.
8. The number of children shall be limited to a maximum of fourteen (14) at any one time, including any of the applicant's own children.

Planning Commission Meeting
October 5, 1999 - Page 4

9. The applicant shall require parents to first park on the driveway apron of the property and then on the street directly in front of the house when picking-up and dropping off children. Parents shall be directed to escort their children to and from the house and to not honk the vehicle horn to indicate their arrival or departure.
10. Children outside shall be supervised at all times to control excessive noise. If the City receives noise complaints from adjacent neighbors the applicant shall agree to work with the Director of Planning and Building Department to mitigate such impacts as determined to be necessary by the Director.
11. Prior to occupancy for a large family child day care home the applicant shall have the home inspected by the San Bruno Fire Department and Building Department for compliance with all applicable requirements of the California Health and Safety Code.
12. Violation of any of the conditions of approval, as determined by the Director of Planning and Building, shall result in immediate calendaring of the use permit for reconsideration and possible revocation.
13. A minimum of two exits shall be provided from the basement area to the outside of the house and all corridors shall have a minimum width of 36 inches.
14. An audible alarm device shall be installed throughout the building and smoke detectors shall be installed in all sleeping rooms, corridors and the basement.
15. One 2A10BC fire extinguisher shall be installed on each floor.
16. The following building and site improvements shall be completed prior to occupancy of the basement area for a large family day care facility:
 - S Require a one-hour rated wall between the garage and the basement room;
 - S Replace heating duct for basement room with code compliant parts and add a vent cover;
 - S Complete construction on the new bathroom off the basement room by installing sheetrock on garage wall;
 - S Complete the side door into the basement room;
 - S Install a permanent walkway from the driveway to the new side entrance;
 - S Install a concrete patio and retaining wall below the upper deck;
 - S Place a permanent railing between the upper deck and the backyard staircase;
 - S Install a locking device on the two gates at the upper and lower end of the outside staircase.
17. The Fire Department shall not approve licencing of the facility until all conditions have been completed to the satisfaction of the City.

(C. Marshall advised of the seven day appeal period).

5. 537 Oak Avenue (Tape File 392)

Request for a Use Permit and Variance to allow the construction of an addition in the rear of an existing one-story, single-family residence resulting in a lot coverage of 2,250 square feet where 2,200 square feet is allowed, a living floor area greater than 1,825 square feet with a one-car garage, and a four (4) foot separation between the main structure and garage, where six (6) feet is required; per Sections 12.12.200.030.B.3, 12.200.080.A.2, and 12.84.140.B of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance. Variance 99-09, Use Permit 99-35 (Public Hearing) Environmental Determination: Categorical Exemption Zoning: Single Family Residential (R-1)

Mr. Padovan entered staff report dated October 5, 1999 into the record. Transparencies of the project were shown. C. Birt asked about bringing the carport up to building code. Mr. Padovan stated the ordinance does not allow an open carport within a certain distance from the property line so there will have to be three feet setback for the support posts and 18" from the property line for the eaves.

The public hearing opened. Bob Hampton, property owner, said there is no problem with removing the carport. He thought it was up to code and built it to store his truck.

Roy Ellis, Oak Avenue, said they have been neighbors for several years and have never had any problems. The carport does not impact him. He is sure the owner will do what needs to be done.

The hearing closed without objection.

M/S Birt, Johnson that the San Bruno Planning Commission approve Use Permit 99-35 and Variance 99-09 subject to the following finding of facts and conditions; passed by the following vote:

AYES: C. Birt, Johnson, Petersen, Sammut, Marshall

NOES: None ABSENT: C. Schindler

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. Proper notice of the public hearing was given by legal notice published in the San Bruno Herald, Saturday, September 25, 1999, and notice mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the project site on September 24, 1999

2. Noticing of the public hearing, conduct of said hearing, and an opportunity for all parties to present testimony was completed in accordance with the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Zoning, Chapter 12.132.

3. The applicant has been notified, both verbally and in writing herein, of the City's provision for an administrative appeal of the Planning Commission's final action to the City Council as provided for in the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.140.

4. The project is Categorical Exempt per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Class 1, Section 15301: Minor expansion to an existing facility.

5. The general appearance of the residential addition is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood and will not be detrimental to the adjacent real property because the design and

**Planning Commission Meeting
October 5, 1999 - Page 6**

materials will match the existing structure and the style of architecture is similar to other homes in the neighborhood.

6. The proposed addition will not unreasonably restrict or interfere with light and air on the property and other properties in the neighborhood, will not hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of land and buildings in the neighborhood, or impair the value thereof, and is consistent with the design and scale of the neighborhood because the addition is situated in the rear of the existing building, uses vertical siding to match the rear of the structure, and is not viewable from the adjacent property to the south or the public right-of-way

7. The construction of the addition to the existing residence is consistent with the San Bruno General Plan, which designates the property for low density residential purposes.

8. The off-street parking should be adequate for the residence because the proposal adds an insignificant amount of floor space, does not create any additional bedrooms, and there is a two car tandem driveway apron in front of the garage.

9. Due to the existing development of the subject property and well as those surrounding, the strict application of this article will deprive the property of privileges enjoyed by other properties in the vicinity and under identical zone classification. The subject property has a non-conforming setback between the main structure and the detached garage, similar to many properties in the surrounding neighborhood. The denial of the addition which meets the majority of city zoning standards and does not effect surrounding property owners would constitute a significant hardship and deprive the property owner of privileges enjoyed by similar residential properties.

10. The granting of this variance, as conditioned, does not constitute a grant of special privilege inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and in the zone district in which the subject property is located. The majority of lots in the surrounding area have some form of nonconforming setbacks between detached structures and the ability to develop their property within the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance is similarly constrained and would justify the granting of a variance.

CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the "Summary of Hearing" to the Department of Planning and Building within 30 days of Planning Commission approval. Until such time as the Summary is filed, UP 99-35 and V 99-09 shall not be valid for any purpose. Use Permit 99-35 and Variance 99-09 shall expire one (1) year from the date of Planning Commission approval unless a building permit has been secured prior to the one (1) year date.

2. The request for a Use Permit and Variance to allow the construction of an addition in the rear of an existing one-story, single-family residence resulting in a lot coverage of 2,250 square feet where 2,200 square feet is allowed, a living floor area greater than 1,825 square feet with a one-car garage, and a four (4) foot separation between the main structure and garage, where six (6) feet is required shall be built according to plans approved by the Planning Commission on October 5, 1999 labeled Exhibit "B," except as required to be modified by these Conditions of Approval. Any modification to

Planning Commission Meeting
October 5, 1999 - Page 7

the approved plans shall require prior approval by the Director of Planning and Building.

3. The applicant shall obtain a City of San Bruno building permit before construction can proceed.
4. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of San Bruno.
5. The residence and garage shall be used only as a single family residential dwelling unit. No portion of the residence or garage shall be rented out as a secondary residential dwelling unit.
6. The garage shall be used for the storage of motor vehicles and shall not be used as habitable living space as defined in the Uniform Building Code. Failure to conform to this condition is grounds for revocation of this permit.
7. Prior to final approval, all debris, inoperable vehicles, and material stockpiled in the garage and on driveway apron in front of the garage **shall be** removed. This area shall be maintained in a trash and debris-free state.
8. Inoperable vehicles **shall not** be stored in the driveway apron per Section 12.10.060 of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance.
9. At the time of Building Permit Plan Check, the existing car port in front of the garage shall be brought up to Building Code.
10. The entire dwelling and garage shall all be painted to match.
11. All drainage from the roof drains shall be directed to the City storm drain.
12. Provide light and ventilation to the proposed addition.
13. Materials and debris shall not be stockpiled within the City right-of-way.
14. Address numbers must be at least four (4) inches in height, of a contrasting color to the background, and must be lighted during the hours of darkness.
15. Sliding doors and windows which are accessible from the ground (or on a balcony) must have lift out resisting hardware and secondary locks.
16. The addition shall meet Uniform Building Code and this shall be illustrated on plans submitted to the Building Department for Plan Check.
17. Install a sewer cleanout at the property line.
18. Materials and debris shall not be stockpiled within the City right-of-way.

Planning Commission Meeting
October 5, 1999 - Page 8

19. Remove and replace broken sidewalk, curb, and gutter.
20. Obtain an encroachment permit from the Department of Public Works for any work in the City right-of -way.

(C. Marshall advised of the seven day appeal period).

6. 307 Hazel Avenue (Tape 392, 393)

Request for a Use Permit and Variance to allow the construction of a two story addition to an existing one story dwelling resulting in a greater than 50% expansion, a Floor area Ratio (FAR) of .69, where .55 is allowed, a lot coverage of 2,225 square feet, where 2,220 square feet is allowed, greater than 2,800 square feet of living area with a two (2) car garage, a zero (0) foot side yard setback where five (5) feet is required, and fourteen (14) foot front setback where fifteen (15) feet is required; per Sections 12.200.030.B.1/2/3, 12.200.080.A.3, and 12.96.060.D.4/5 of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance. Use Permit 99-37, Variance 99-10 (Public Hearing) Environmental Determination: Categorical Exemption Zoning: Single Family Residential (R-1)

C. Marshall abstained from this item due to a conflict of interest with the project architect. C. Birt assumed as chair.

Mr. Padovan entered staff report dated October 5, 1999 into the record. Transparencies of the project were shown.

The public hearing opened. John Geniali, the applicant and property owner, was present. Mr. Geniali stated he has lived at this home for 15 years and has out grown it and needs more room. They wanted to try and keep as much of the existing home as possible and the garage will remain at its present location. He spoke to his neighbor on the south side who supported the project and has no problem with the garage being on property line. The addition will enhance the area and provide additional off street parking. Mr. Padovan stated the applicant provided letters supporting the project.

C. Sammut asked about the door at the rear of the garage. Mr. Geniali responded the door is below the stairwell windows on the south elevation and will provide access to the crawl space under the house. C. Petersen asked the existing setback. Mr. Geniali said the existing garage wall is about 20" from the property line and allowing 2" for clearance makes the setback a few inches less than two feet. C. Petersen asked if consideration was given to providing a setback on the south side. Mr. Geniali stated this was considered but required losing a large portion of the existing foundation. C. Sammut asked the percentage of the foundation he would be able to use. Mr. Geniali replied the foundation at the garage, living room, and dining room will be kept.

The hearing closed without objection.

Planning Commission Meeting
October 5, 1999 - Page 9

M/S Johnson, Sammut that the San Bruno Planning Commission approve Use Permit 99-37 and Variance 99-10 subject to the following finding of facts and conditions; passed by the following vote:

AYES: C. Johnson, Sammut, Petersen, Birt

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: C. Marshall

ABSENT: C. Schindler

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. Proper notice of the public hearing was given by legal notice published in the San Bruno Herald, Saturday, September 25, 1999, and 42 notices mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the project site on September 24, 1999
2. Noticing of the public hearing, conduct of said hearing, and an opportunity for all parties to present testimony was completed in accordance with the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Zoning, Chapter 12.132.
3. The applicant has been notified, both verbally and in writing herein, of the City's provision for an administrative appeal of the Planning Commission's final action to the City Council as provided for in the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.140.
4. The project is Categorically Exempt per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Class 1, Section 15301: Minor expansion to an existing facility.
5. The general appearance of the residential addition is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood and will not be detrimental to the adjacent real property because the design and materials will match the existing structure and the style of architecture is similar to other homes in the neighborhood.
6. The proposed addition will not unreasonably restrict or interfere with light and air on the property and other properties in the neighborhood, will not hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of land and buildings in the neighborhood, or impair the value thereof, and is consistent with the design and scale of the neighborhood.
7. The construction of the addition to the existing residence is consistent with the San Bruno General Plan, which designates the property for low density residential purposes.
8. The off-street parking should be adequate for the residence because the proposal calls for expanding an existing non-conforming two (2) car garage into a conforming two (2) car garage, and thereby creating an adequately sized two (2) car driveway apron.
9. Due to the existing development of the subject property and well as those surrounding, the strict application of this article will deprive the property of privileges enjoyed by other properties in the vicinity and under identical single-family residential zone classification. The subject property currently has a non-conforming side yard setback between on the southern property line, similar to many properties in the surrounding neighborhood. The denial of the addition which meets the majority of city zoning standards and does not effect surrounding property owners would constitute a significant hardship and deprive the property owner of privileges enjoyed by similar residential properties.

Planning Commission Meeting
October 5, 1999 - Page 10

10. The granting of this Variance, as conditioned, does not constitute a grant of special privilege inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and in the single-family residential zone district in which the subject property is located. The majority of lots in the surrounding area have some form of nonconforming side yard setbacks and the ability to develop their property within the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance is similarly constrained and would justify the granting of a Variance.

CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the "Summary of Hearing" to the Department of Planning and Building within 30 days of Planning Commission approval. Until such time as the Summary is filed, Use Permit 99-37 & Variance 99-10 shall not be valid for any purpose. Use Permit 99-37 & Variance 99-10 shall expire one (1) year from the date of Planning Commission approval unless a building permit has been secured prior to the one (1) year date.

2. The request for a Use Permit and Variance to allow the construction of a two-story addition to an existing one story dwelling resulting in a greater than 50% expansion, a Floor area Ratio (FAR) of .65, where .55 is allowed, a height of 30 feet, where 28 feet is allowed, a zero (0) foot side yard setback where five (5) feet is required, and a fourteen (14) foot front setback where fifteen (15) feet is required; shall be built according to plans approved by the Planning Commission on October 5, 1999 labeled Exhibit "B," except as required to be modified by these Conditions of Approval. Any modification to the approved plans shall require prior approval by the Director of Planning and Building.

3. The applicant shall obtain a City of San Bruno building permit before construction can proceed.

4. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of San Bruno.

5. The residence and garage shall be used only as a single-family residential dwelling unit. No portion of the residence or garage shall be rented out as a secondary residential dwelling unit.

6. The garage shall be used for the storage of motor vehicles and shall not be used as habitable living space as defined in the Uniform Building Code. Failure to conform to this condition is grounds for revocation of this permit.

7. Prior to Building Permit Plan Check, the two windows in the master bedroom shall be changed to half windows.

8. Address numbers must be at least four (4) inches in height, of a contrasting color to the background, and must be lighted during the hours of darkness.

**Planning Commission Meeting
October 5, 1999 - Page 11**

9. Sliding doors and windows which are accessible from the ground (or on a balcony) must have lift out resisting hardware and secondary locks.
10. The entire two story structure shall all be painted to match.
11. All drainage from the roof drains shall be directed to the City storm drain.
12. Materials and debris shall not be stockpiled within the City right-of-way.
13. Install a sewer cleanout at the property line.
14. The roof spout shall be collected to a drainage system that discharge the storm water thru a curb drain.
15. Submit a current title report. The new addition shall not encroach onto any easements.
16. Designer shall ensure that the existing water meter is big enough for the new addition. Submit hydraulic calculations if the meter needs to be up-sized.
17. Remove and replace broken sidewalk, curb, and gutter.
18. Obtain an encroachment permit from the Department of Public Works for any work in the City right-of -way.

(C. Birt advised of the seven day appeal period).

C. Marshall assumed as chair.

**7. San Bruno Towne Center (Continued from September 21, 1999) (Tape 393)
Annual review of the Development Agreement for the San Bruno Towne Center pursuant to California Government Code Section 65865.1 and San Bruno Resolution 1986-77.
Development Agreement 99-02 (Public Hearing) Environmental Determination: Categorical Exemption Zoning: Planned Development (P-D)**

Based upon staff's recommendation, M/S Sammut, Johnson to continue this item to November 16, 1999 Planning Commission meeting; all ayes. Absent: C. Schindler

8. 1340 El Camino Real (Tape 393 A, B)

Request for a Planned Development Permit to modify the existing San Bruno Towne Center Planned Development Permit and allow the interior and exterior remodel of an existing Costco warehouse store into a Lowe's home improvement retail warehouse resulting in the elimination of 11,383 square feet of existing retail space, the replacement of this space with a 23,989 square foot Lowe's Garden Center, and the reconfiguration of the existing parking lot and signage to accommodate the new tenant; per Section 12.96.190 and Chapter 12.108 of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance. Planned Development Permit 99-03 (Public Hearing) Environmental Determination: Categorical Exemption Zoning: Planned Development (P-D)

Planning Commission Meeting
October 5, 1999 - Page 12

Mr. Padovan entered staff report dated October 5, 1999 into the record. Transparencies of the project were shown. Colored renderings of the project were provided.

The public hearing opened. Howard Wexler, attorney for the Towne Center, stated the Towne Center was started in 1986 and has served the needs of the city. It is critical that Costco be replaced with the same type of tax level and services. Mr. Wexler introduced the members of the Lowe's team.

Stephen Gale was present to represent Lowe's and gave background information on their retail operation. Mr. Gale stated it is not Lowe's policy to stack merchandise in front of the store such as hot tubs, sheds, etc. They carry basically the same type of merchandise as Home Depot. Their focus is the residential homeowner. They are a 52 year old company and operate 550 stores in the U.S. In 2-1/2 to 3 years, they plan to have about 300 stores on the West coast. It is an upscale home improvement operation and they try to hire from the local community. The renovation of the existing building will cost about \$23 million.

The typical hours of operation are 6:00 A.M. to 9:00 P.M. They will have a 25 year lease at the Towne Center. Mr. Wexler explained there are four legal separate parcels and Venture Retail Group would be acquiring this parcel from Costco and lease it to Lowe's.

Matt Dubbe, architect, stated they will be dealing with the landscaping and eliminating the existing planters, reducing the mound along Huntington Avenue, and increase visibility throughout the parking lot. The entry will be relocated to the center of the store and they will provide some weather protection by installing canopies. C. Johnson asked about placing demarcation flags around the parking lot and providing better lighting. She added the additional hours of operation should alleviate some of the problems in the parking lot. C. Sammut pointed out one of the proposed improvements is a sidewalk from Huntington Avenue to the center. Mr. Dubbe stated the lighting will be upgraded and is within the parameters dictated in the design guidelines. Mr. Padovan said the city requires 1 foot candle at ground level, and the lighting plan shows up to 4 and 5 foot candles throughout the parking lot.

Richard Chavez, project civil engineer, gave a basic overview of the site layout. Mr. Chavez stated access from Huntington Avenue will remain the same and loading and unloading will be from Noor Avenue. The parking will be changed from one-way 75E parking aisle to two-way 90E parking. The planters at the end of the aisle will be reconfigured. There will be two lanes of traffic at the canopy area in front of the store. Thirty 10 foot wide parking spaces will be provided for contractors. As far as the lighting, he is uncertain what the current light standard is but Lowe's prides itself on safety and will provide ample lighting.

C. Sammut pointed out the parking carts look staggered. Mr. Chavez stated there is one parking corral for each row of spaces and he knows no reason why they are staggered. C. Sammut suggested he contact staff to work this out. C. Marshall inquired if there would be wheel stops in front of the parking spaces. Mr. Chavez responded there would not be stops since that makes it easier to clean the lot and avoid tripping hazards.

Planning Commission Meeting
October 5, 1999 - Page 13

Mr. Foscardo stated staff and the applicant will work with the Crime Prevention Officer to check the lighting levels. The location of parking aisles should be easier with the entrance at the center of the building and people should remember if they parked to the left or right of that.

John Bunutto was present to represent the property owner, Venture Retail Group. Mr. Bunutto stated discussion was had regarding the impacts of Lowe's on the overall parking and parking ratios at the center. They will eliminate about 11,000 sq. ft. retail space and replace that with an enclosed garden area and reconfigure the parking within that parcel. 24 parking spaces will be lost at the back of the garden center; 31 at the front loading area and an additional 45 spaces throughout the parking area. The end result will be one space for every 214.6 sq. ft. In 1990, there was one space for every 220 sq. ft and in 1994, one space for every 213 sq. ft. Traffic will be less than what CostCo generates. There will be a reduction of restaurant area of about 2500 sq. ft.

C. Birt inquired about the current uses at the proposed garden area. Mr. Bunutto responded some tenants will be relocated in other areas of the center while others have chosen to vacate the center. Mr. Foscardo stated the Commission might also want to consider the signage at the entrance to the Center from Huntington Avenue as part of this application. Traffic signals will be placed at the Sneath Lane and Burger King site, at Sneath and Huntington, and the entrance to the new BART garage. C. Marshall asked how parking would be enforced so BART passengers do not park at the Towne Center lot. Mr. Bunutto stated he hopes that will not be a huge problem but there will be some security at the site.

C. Petersen commented the trash collection on Huntington has been neglected but with the reduced landscaping mound, it should be easier to clean that area. Mr. Bunutto said there is a full time porter at the center for cart patrol and clean-up.

C. Birt asked the number of employees on an average work day and parking location. Mr. Gale responded there would probably be 75 at the most at any one time and employee parking areas are designated.

C. Marshall inquired about community support. Mr. Gale said the store manager has the ability to designate \$2000-\$3000 per year for community involvement.

The public hearing closed without objection.

C. Johnson inquired which is a better parking arrangement, angle or 90 degree. Mr. Foscardo responded one design is not better than the other; it depends upon the driver. With the added pedestrian walkway, customers can go from the new bus facility, neighborhoods, etc. C. Petersen pointed out the monument signs needs attention and some seem to hold up better than others. Mr. Foscardo stated staff will work with the owner and management company.

M/S Johnson, Petersen that the San Bruno Planning Commission approve Architectural Review Permit 99-14 and Planned Development Permit 99-03 subject to the following findings of fact and conditions; passed by the following vote:

AYES: C. Johnson, Petersen, Birt, Sammut, Marshall

Planning Commission Meeting
October 5, 1999 - Page 14

NOES: None ABSENT: C. Schindler

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. Proper notice of the public hearing was given by legal notice published in the San Bruno Herald, Saturday, September 25, 1999, and notice mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the site on September 24, 1999.
2. Noticing of the public hearing, conduct of said hearing, and an opportunity for all parties to present testimony was completed in accordance with the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Zoning, Chapter 12.132.
3. The applicant has been notified, both verbally and in writing herein, of the City's provision for an administrative appeal of the Planning Commission's final action to the City Council as provided for in the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.140.
4. The Planned Development and Architectural Review Permit to modify the existing San Bruno Towne Center Planned Development Permit and allow the interior and exterior remodel of an existing CostCo warehouse store into a Lowe's Home Improvement retail warehouse resulting in the elimination of 11,383 square feet of existing retail space directly adjacent to CostCo, the replacement of this space with a 23,989 square foot Lowe's Garden Center, and the reconfiguration of the parking lot and signage to accommodate the new tenant at 1340 El Camino Real will not be injurious or detrimental to the property and improvement in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the city because the use is compatible with existing uses in the area and there is adequate parking and circulation.
5. If the following conditions of approval are adhered to, the Architectural Review Permit and Planned Development Permit will not unreasonably restrict or interfere with light and air on the property and other property in the neighborhood, will not hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of land and buildings in the neighborhood, nor impair the value thereof, and is consistent with the design and scale of the neighborhood.
6. The proposed project is categorically exempt and will not affect or damage natural resources or features. The facility is located in an urban environment within a predominantly developed commercial district.
7. The proposed use is consistent with the general plan which allows for retail home improvement warehouses in this commercial zone and there are retail uses in the property's vicinity.
8. The Conditions of Approval imposed on this request should adequately regulate and mitigate potential negative impacts that might be associated with this type of use.
9. The general appearance of the new facility is in keeping with the character of the commercial uses in the San Bruno Towne Center and will not be detrimental to the adjacent real property because lighting and noise impacts are minimal, landscaping is improved and the size and scale of the building are similar to other buildings in the area.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the "Summary of Hearing" to the Department of Planning and Building within 30 days of Planning Commission approval. Until such time as the Summary is filed the Architectural Review Permit (AR-99-14) and Planned Development Permit (PDP-99-03) shall not be valid for any purpose. These permits shall expire one (1) year from the date of Planning Commission approval unless a building permit has been secured prior to the one year date.
2. The proposal to allow the interior and exterior remodel of an existing CostCo warehouse store into a Lowe's Home Improvement retail warehouse resulting in the elimination of 11,383 square feet of existing retail space directly adjacent to CostCo, the replacement of this space with a 23,989 square foot Lowe's Garden Center, and the reconfiguration of the parking lot and signage to accommodate the new tenant at 1340 El Camino Real shall be built according to the plans approved by the Planning Commission on October 5, 1999 labeled Exhibit "B" except as required to be modified by these conditions of approval. Any modification to the approved plans shall require prior review and approval by the Director of Planning and Building.
3. The applicant shall obtain a City building permit before construction can proceed.
4. All landscaping shall be automatically sprinklered and the site shall be maintained in a litter free state. The applicant shall enter into a Maintenance of Landscaping Agreement with the City prior to occupancy of the building.
5. A complete landscape plan shall be submitted with the building permit plans. The following landscape improvements shall be included in the landscape plans:
 - All dead and missing landscaping shall be replaced with similar plants.
 - The islands within the parking lot shall not be mounded and shall be planted with trees and groundcover to aid visibility;
 - All landscaping shall be wind and drought tolerant;
 - Runoff from planter areas shall not be permitted to drain into storm drains. Contain within planter areas.
6. The applicant shall comply with the Public Works Department "Commercial Building Permit Application Requirements". In addition, the applicant shall comply with the following:
 - C Remove and replace any cracked sidewalk, curb and gutter along Huntington Avenue.
 - C Submit site improvement and utility plans.
 - Install backflow prevention devices for domestic, irrigation and fireflow.
 - Provide hydraulic calculations for new domestic and fire water lines/meters.
 - Obtain an encroachment permit for any work in the City of San Bruno public right-of-way.
 - Use City standard drawing for commercial driveway approach.
 - Install filters in all catch basins within the parking area.
 - All roof downspouts shall be connected to an underground system.
 - The applicant shall comply the all applicable BMP's during construction.
7. The Fire Department connection shall be moved to Huntington Avenue.

Planning Commission Meeting
October 5, 1999 - Page 16

8. Maintain Class III stand pipes within the interior.
9. Maintain and install appropriate 2A10BC extinguishers/ mounted and labeled 75 feet travel distance.
10. All sprinkler systems shall meet the requirements of N.F.P.A. #13. All bathroom, closets and pantries shall be fire sprinkled.
11. The applicant shall comply with all Police Department Conditions.
12. The painting and sign posting for the handicap parking stall must comply with standards set forth in California Vehicle Code section 22511.8. The parking lot must also be posted in compliance with California Vehicle Code section 22658(a) to allow the removal of illegally parked vehicles.
13. Designated fire lanes must be painted in compliance with California Vehicle Code section 22500.1 and City Ordinance 7.16.040 D.
 - A. On the curbs bracketing the entrance and exit as well as those bracketing the driveways.
 - B. On all raised curbs in the parking lot which do not directly abut a parking space.
14. The trash enclosure shall be covered to prevent stormwater runoff into the City storm drains. All hazardous materials shall be stored within an enclosed, covered area and shall be stored within a secondary containment area.
15. An anti-graffiti coating shall be placed on all blank walls.
16. The new pylon sign at Huntington Avenue shall be designed as follows:
 - S Maximum height of 23 feet from grade, Maximum width of 14 feet;
 - S Incorporate Towne Center script and logo within the top portion of the sign;
 - S Contain three sign panels with Lowe's on the top panel;
 - S Have a minimum height of seven feet between the lowest sign panel and grade;
 - S Match the colors, materials and design of the existing pylon sign on Sneath Lane.
17. The applicant shall work with staff on identification of parking aisles within the parking area and the provision of adequate lighting throughout the Lowe's parking area.
18. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City.

(C. Marshall advised of the seven day appeal period).

(Recess called at 9:00 P.M., meeting reconvened at 9:15 P.M.)

9. Specific Plan Study Session (Public Comment)

Request for public comment for a proposed specific plan for properties bounded by Cherry Avenue, Sneath Lane, El Camino Real, and I-380 excepting the Airport Trade Center properties, the lands owned by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints and the medical building at 1001 Sneath Lane. Environmental Determination: Environmental Impact Report Zoning: Administrative Research (A-R) Neighborhood Commercial (C-N) High Density Residential (R-4) Open Space (O)

Mr. Padovan provided an oral update and colored renderings of the proposal. The exact location of the intersection between Tanforan and this site has not yet been determined. Mr. Foscardo explained that if the Marines retain Building 103 they are required to have a clearance of 250 feet around the building and this will impact the location of the intersection. They could relocate to another portion of the site or the developer could find them a place elsewhere. The Navy anticipates they will be out of the property by July 1, 2000.

Mr. Foscardo suggested a Citizen's Advisory Committee consisting of ten members be formed to gain information from the stakeholders around the site, representative for senior housing, one Planning Commissioner, and interested community members. It is anticipated this would be an informal committee with a flexible meeting schedule. Hopefully there would be some consensus of what the development parameters might be. It is assumed the meetings would be open to the public but not public hearings.

Gary Fleming, Emaron Drive, referenced a letter from Al Watson dated September 22, 1999 citing the main concern in this whole process is the citizens do not get put into a box where the only option for the Navy site is high rise hotels and housing. Should look at things that could be uplifting to the community such as a library. Should consider what impacts any development would have on the community, enhancements that will be provided; and revenue generated to the city. Getting community input is a positive step. He is confident the Planning Commission will do the right thing and keep an open mind. They should make sure that the zoning in that area provides for public and quasi-public facilities.

Joan Korsch, Fleetwood Drive, encouraged the Planning commission to consider this committee since people are really concerned about this issue and this is a big development. Input should be gathered from the people immediately surrounding the site as well as interested citizens.

Public comment closed without objection.

Mr. Foscardo stated when looking at cultural operations, those would be non-revenue generating uses and he is unsure how many different types of uses could go on the site. The property will be sold to the highest bidder.

C. Petersen encouraged neighbors to come forward with any comments and staff is doing a good job of exposing the planning process to the public. Mr. Padovan asked the Commissioners to advise him if they would like to take a tour of the site.

10. City Staff Discussion (Tape 393)

Mr. Foscardo stated staff met with the operators of the senior care facilities and no one has been relocated and some of the providers are thinking about building additions. The Architectural Review Committee will meet on October 14, 1999 with C. Sammut and a poll will be taken to find two other members.

11. Planning Commission Discussion

C. Marshall asked that the Commission be notified when appeals have been filed with the Council so a representative could attend that meeting. C. Marshall inquired if service stations need to come before the Commission when remodeling. Mr. Padovan stated some are approved at the Architectural Review committee level while others do come before the Commission.

C. Birt asked the status of the site at El Camino Real and San Luis Avenue. Mr. Foscardo stated staff is working with the new owners and explaining to them that multiple uses will not be allowed on that site.

C. Johnson asked staff to review the sign program at 421 El Camino Real. Regarding the board and care homes, they are approved by both the city and the state and she does not understand how the Fire Department gave approval to some of these about ten years ago. C. Petersen commented city staff has been working with property owners who have put rooms in their garages.

C. Sammut asked staff about the double yellow line in front of the Lomita Park School. Mr. Foscardo said he would look into this.

12. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:55 P.M. by motion made and passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

George D. Foscardo
Planning Commission Secretary

Jan Aki, Recording Secretary